Serial No.: 10/511,490 Filed: 10/14/2005 Page: 9 of 12

REMARKS

The present remarks and amendments are responsive to the Office Action mailed on June 11, 2009. Claims 44-61, 63-68, 71, and 73-74 are pending in this application. Claims 1-43, 62, 69, and 70, were canceled by previous amendment. Also accompanying this communication is a petition to extend the prosecution on this matter for one month and the appropriate fee.

By the following remarks and amendments, pending claims 44-61, 63-68, 71, and 73-74 are believed to be in condition for allowance and are again presented for reconsideration.

Discussion of the Office Action

In the Office Action of June 11, 2009, the Examiner specifically rejected claims 44-61, 63-68, 71, and 73-74 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gygi et al. (Nature Biotechnology, 1999, IDS) (Gygi).

Rejection of claims 44-74 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

As set forth above, claims 44-61, 63-68, 71 and 73-74 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gygi et al. (Nature Biotechnology, 1999, IDS) (Gygi). The Applicants must traverse the rejection in light of the amendments and comments contained herein.

The Applicant has amended the last element of each of base claims 44, 63, 71 and 73-74 to include the limitations of having the reference sample and the first peptide mixture (biological sample) unlabeled. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the applied and sole reference, i.e., Gygi et al., does not teach or suggest such limitations expressly or impliedly. The reference "Quantitation analysis of complex protein mixtures using isotopecoded affinity tags," as authored by Gygi et al., describes a method of assessing relative peptide concentrations using mass spectrometry and isotope-coded affinity tags (ICATS). The isotope-labeled methodology creates peptides that although differing in mass, have

Applicant: Bondarenko et al. Docket No.: 1004US/NAT

Serial No.: 10/511,490 Filed: 10/14/2005 Page: 10 of 12

chemical and physical properties, such as chromatographic retention time and ionization efficiency that are similar to their counterparts. Specifically, Gygi describes an approach wherein a peptide is <u>labeled</u> differently in differently samples, which are then combined and submitted for mass spectral analysis (see for example, Fig. 2).

By contradistinction, the present application teaches and as similarly disclosed in each of the amended independent claims that the peptide mixture (biological sample) and the reference sample can be unlabeled. For example, as disclosed on page 5 of the specification, lines 19-23, the Applicant states, "No labor-intensive and time-consuming labeling of samples is needed prior to analysis. Likewise, no expensive reagents are required to create an internal standard, as in isotope-coded affinity tag (ICAT) or similar methods. The techniques are not limited to proteins that contain particular aminio acids (such as custeine)."

In addition, and as asserted in the response to the Office Action mailed November 11, 2008, Applicant again respectfully submits that one skilled in the art would not have combined his teaching with Gygi et al. to include an external standard as presented in each of the independent claims, as discussed in the response mailed 4/21/09. The reasoning behind such an assertion is that along with arguments presented in the response mailed on 4/21/099, Gygi et al. specifically excludes the possibility of an external sample because the samples are combined prior to analysis. In particular, Gygi et al. states on page 995, column 2, first full paragraph that "pairs of peptides tagged with the light and heavy ICAT reagents, respectively, are chemically identical and therefore serve as mutual internal standards for accurate identification." Therefore, Applicant submits that one skilled in the art at the time of the present invention would not have modified the teachings of Gygi et al., i.e., (Nature Biotechnology VOL. 17 October 1999) to provide for the present invention because the technique required the use of an internal standard.

At the very least, Applicant respectfully submits that the reference (Gygi et al) does not teach nor suggest the use of unlabeled counterparts (e.g., an unlabeled reference sample and an unlabeled first peptide mixture (or biological sample), as

Applicant: Bondarenko et al. Docket No.: 1004US/NAT Serial No.: 10/511,490

Filed: 10/14/2005 Page: 11 of 12

disclosed in the present application and as shown in the last element of each of

independent claims 44, 63, 71 and 73-74.

Regarding claims 45-61, and claims 64-68, such claims either directly or

indirectly depend from their respective base claims and thus inherit the limitations of

such base claims.

Under MPEP \$2143.01,

"If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any

claim depending therefrom is nonobvious." In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5

USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 45-61,

and claims 64-68 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is also improper and is requested to be removed, as

mandated under MPEP §2143.01.

CONCLUSION

The undersigned respectfully submits that, in view of Applicant's amendments

and comments, the rejections of the claims raised in the Final Office Action dated June 11,

2009 have been fully addressed and overcome, and the present application is believed to be

in condition for allowance.

It is respectfully requested that this application be reconsidered, that remaining

pending claims 44-61, 63-68, and 71, 73-74 be allowed and that this case be passed to issue.

In the event that the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of

these claims that can be clarified with a telephone conference, he is respectfully requested

to initiate the same with the undersigned at (408) 965-6200.

Applicant: Bondarenko et al. Serial No.: 10/511,490 Filed: 10/14/2005 Page: 12 of 12

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16, 1.17, and 1.21 that may be required by this communication to Deposit Account No. 50-3267.

By:

Dated: September 19, 2009

Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc. ATTN: IP Department 355 River Oaks Parkway San Jose, California 95134 Tel: (408) 965-6200

Fax: (408) 965-6010

Respectfully submitted,

Docket No.: 1004US/NAT

Michael C. Staggs Reg. No. 50,938